

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Keith Letmon,)	C.A. No. 4:09-55-TLW-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Larry Powers;)	
Dr. Bianco,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. # 1). This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). (Doc. # 34). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that the defendant Bianco’s motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 22) and defendant Power’s motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 28) be granted.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. No objections have been filed to the Report.¹ In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of

¹The Report was sent to the plaintiff at the only address provided by the plaintiff on file with the clerk’s office. The Report was returned.

the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

A review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 34), defendant Bianco's motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 22) and defendant Power's motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 28) are **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

March 5, 2010
Florence, South Carolina